

LOSS PREVENTION SUBCOMMITTEE
Oct. 22, 2003
MEETING MINUTES

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Dennis Anderson	Department of Health
Gary Andrews	Department of Corrections
Andreta Armstrong	Department of Licensing
Kathy Gastreich	Department of Corrections
Bill Henselman	Department of Transportation
Larry Keller	Department of Ecology
Carole Mathews	Labor & Industries
Stephen Simmons	Department of Social and Health Services
Jim Smego	Department of Natural Resources
Tom Wendel	Office of the Attorney General

Absent

Linda Ramsey	Military Department
--------------	---------------------

Guests

Bryan Bazard	Department of General Administration, State Motor Pool
Andrea Brown	Office of Financial Management
David Carr	University of Washington
Teresa Douglas	South Puget Sound Community College
Beate Wahl	Grays Harbor Community College

OFM Risk Management Staff

Jolene Bellows
Mike Kirkpatrick
John Nicholson

Kathy Gastreich called the meeting to order.

Member and staff introductions.

Minutes of the September 24, 2003, meeting were approved with the addition of adding language to items #5, 6, 7 & 8 described below.

The committee continued discussion of new driver/vehicle recommendations that will be added to a new chapter in SAAM.

The remaining items listed will be covered at the October 22 meeting:

- #5 - Insurance Coverage and Accident Reporting Policies
- #6 - Orientation/Training Requirements for State Vehicle and POV Drivers
- #7 - Vehicle Purchase, Disposal and Maintenance

- #8 – Agency Responsibilities for State Vehicles/Drivers. Vehicle-related definitions

Section #5 - Insurance Coverage and Accident Reporting Policies

- A matrix format for the insurance coverage and accident reporting policies section was drafted. This could be linked to the OFM website creating a user-friendly format for accessing SAAM vehicle and driver requirements. Keeping information current could be challenging.
- Section on student drivers – It was confirmed that L&I Employment Standards requires drivers to be 18 years of age when driving on business.
- A suggestion was made that the student driver's definition should be clarified to allow each college to define "student".
- A suggestion for more clarity in contractor vehicle language – often contractors are the owners of their own businesses and don't have to be covered by L&I. A brief indemnification clause could be developed, which agencies would be advised to use to indicate contractors are permitted to drive agency-owned vehicles.

Section #6 - Orientation/Training Requirements for State Vehicle and POV Drivers

Members questioned why SUV's were singled out and why the "1,000 miles" was chosen as a benchmark to require training. Some felt agencies should set benchmarks.

Grays Harbor CC trains ALL drivers in the 15-passenger van basic training for easy determination of who gets training. There was a concern that mandatory initial training and renewal training would be costly for agencies. Members recommended agency discretion in determining the type of safe driving program used and renewal intervals.

Andrea Brown discussed the difference between "policy" and "guideline" in SAAM. There was concern that too much agency discretion might not address all safe-driving program users. It is important there be policies and procedures for drivers/vehicles.

Defensive Driving –

Members questioned the difference between defensive driver training and watching the 12-minute video being developed for state agencies. The video was intended to be required viewing by all new drivers. Agencies felt use of this video should be at the agencies' discretion. Members suggested that each agency be allowed to determine defensive driver training based on the needs of the agency.

Drivers Checklist –

The license check shouldn't be limited to just the 15-passenger van. Members questioned whether the van requirements should apply to all sized vans, but no decision was reached on changing the current 15 passenger van requirements.

Checklist use was discussed and it was decided that checklists would not be mandatory, but that specified criteria to discuss with the driver would be designated. The checklist will be provided as an option in SAAM.

Sec. #8 – Agency Responsibility

There was a question on what lowest effective cost per mile meant, which is an existing SAAM requirement. Some of the existing agency responsibility requirements may need updates along with any new items included under this section.

Proof of Liability Form – The form is not required, but it was decided there would be value in using it. Other states have similar forms. Will be available on the Internet so agencies can download and copy. The bottom section needs improved wording regarding rendering first aid. Carole Mathews has language from L&I policies that would be more appropriate for this section. She will send it to Jolene so changes can be made.

State driver recommendations with personnel-related factors (i.e., checking DOL driving histories) will be forwarded to Washington Works. Forwarding these suggestions to Washington Works will be addressed at the RMAC meeting in December. Members discussed the issue of providing drivers license abstracts once a year. A requirement that employees notify their supervisors within 24 hours if their license is suspended will be added to the new SAAM state driver policies.

Discussion and feedback received from today's meeting is reflected in the final state driver/vehicle recommendations. The following summarizes the final recommendations:

- Checklist – Agency discretion only - not required.
- Recommend that a new chapter be added to the SAAM manual incorporating new and previous requirements for driver/vehicle usage.
- Recommend each agency be required to implement a driver/vehicle program. Program be designed to meet individual characteristics of each agency and to include certain minimum elements as described in new SAAM chapter.
- Recommend agencies have a discussion with certain drivers (define by criteria) regarding their responsibilities as a state driver.

- Recommend that drivers who meet "criteria" receive defensive driver training. Training for renewal periods is at agency discretion.
- Recommend driver/vehicle recommendations that have personnel implications be transmitted to OFM Washington Works for consideration in changes being made to the civil service system.

The next meeting will be January 21, 2004.

The January 21, agenda will include completing any unfinished business on the vehicle/driver recommendation and discussion of employment cases and issues that are causing liability.

The LPSC will develop strategies for loss prevention on employment related liabilities as part of the new loss prevention focus.